Understanding Quantum Entanglement of Bipartite System Based on Bell Inequality

Li-Bin Fu[1] *, Jing-Ling Chen[1,2] †, Xian-Geng Zhao[1], and Shi-Gang Chen[1]
[1] *Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, P.O. Box 8009 (26), 100088 Beijing, China*
[2] *Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, National University of Singapore, Lower Kent Ridge, Singapore 119260, Republic of Singapore.*

arXiv:quant-ph/0112155v1 24 Dec 2001

Abstract

We present an alternative definition of quantum entanglement for bipartite system based on Bell inequality and operators' noncommutativity. A state is said to be entangled, if the maximum of CHSH expectation value $F_{\max}$ is obtain by noncommutative measures on each particle of the bipartite system; otherwise, the state is a disentangled state. A uniform measure quantifying the degree of entanglement for any state of the bipartite system is also proposed.

03.65.Bz, 03.65.-w, 03.67.-a

The importance of quantum entanglement and Bell inequality is not extravagant. Actually, it has been stressed in voluminous articles that the essential feature of quantum mechanics that is taken advantage of by quantum computation is *quantum entanglement*, the phenomenon referred to by Schrödinger as "the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics" [1]. In recent year, quantum entanglement has become not only a tool for exposing the weirdness of quantum mechanics [2–4], but also a more powerful resource in a number of applications, such as quantum cryptography [5,6], teleportation [7], dense coding [8], communication protocols and computation [9,10]. The superior potentiality of entangled states has raised a nature question: "How much are two particles entangled?" As a foundation property of quantum system, quantum entanglement has been extensively studied in connection with Bell inequality [2]. For a pure state of a two-qubit system, because there exists an equivalence between "entangled states" and "states that violate the Bell inequality" [11,12], it is not difficult to quantify the degree of entanglement for two qubits in a pure state. Much has been done in this field [13–15] and all of them are consistent with the same physical interpretation: how much a pure state violates the Bell inequality. However, theory of entanglement for mixed quantum states is much more complicated and still less well understood. Even qualitative distinctions between local and nonlocal states are unclear, for example, many entangled mixed states never violate the Bell inequality. It seems that people still lack witness to determine whether a mixed states is entangled. Although there are many works devoted to quantify the entanglement of mixed states [14,17,18], the physical interpretations of them are somewhat different from one another.

The difficulty we encounter for mixed states is that the equivalence between "entangled states" and "states that violate the Bell inequality" is no longer held. Nevertheless, as a foundation for testing nonlocal quantum correlation of states, we believe that Bell inequality is a powerful tool to determine the nonlocal correlations for not only pure states, but also mixed states. An important and essential difference between quantum and classical theory is the commutativity of operators, namely, the quantum measurement can be noncommutative, while the classical measurement must be commutative. Indeed, the relationship between the noncommutativity of operators and the violation of the Bell inequality has been investigated in the light of the n-particle Bell inequality discovered by Mermin [19]. However, for a bipartite system, it seems that some important properties hidden behind the equivalence between "entangled states" and "states that violate the Bell inequality" have not yet been discussed throughly. In this Letter, based on Bell inequality and noncommutativity of measure operators, we present an alternative definition of quantum entanglement for two-qubit system; a uniform measure quantifying the degree of entanglement is also proposed. One finds that, for pure states, to obtain the maximal violations of Bell inequality, the measure operators must satisfy some proper commutative relations. More precisely, for a factorizable states, to obtain the maximum value of inequality, the measures on one of the two particles must be commutative; but for all entangled pure states (states are not factorizable), the measures on each particle must be noncommutative. This commutativity of measures is essential and important, and should hold for any bipartite state.

*Email address: fu_libin@mail.iapcm.ac.cn
†Email address: jinglingchen@eyou.com

Let us first briefly review the result of a pair of spin-1/2 particles. We perform the measurements either A or A' on one particle, and either B or B' on the other, where A, A', B and B' denote any physical variables with maximum absolute value 1. Let $E(A, B)$, denote the expectation values of the product AB. After defining F as

$$F = E(A, B) + E(A, B') + E(A', B) - E(A', B'), \tag{1}$$

the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality can be written as

$$-2 \leq F \leq 2. \tag{2}$$

It holds in any theory of local hidden variables, but all entangled pure states violate it. It has been shown by Gisin [12] that the maximum value of the CHSH inequality for a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of a spin-1/2 particle pairs, $F_{\max}(\psi) = 2\sqrt{1 + P_E^2}$, in which P_E is a real number between 0 and 1 – zero for a factorizable pure states and unit for a maximally entangled states. For pure states, the distinction between entangled states and disentangled states can be equivalently regarded as whether the state can violate the above inequality (2). Hence the number P_E describes how much a state violate this inequality. Because the maximum value of the CHSH inequality of factorizable states is 2 that does not violate the inequality, these states are disentangled, but for any other pure states $F_{\max}(\psi) > 2$, so they are entangled. Besides the equivalence between "entangled states" and "states that violate the Bell inequality", there exists another substantial difference between entangled states and disentangled states: the commutativity of measures to realize the maximum value of CHSH inequality are different for entangled states and disentangled states.

It can be proved that for an entangled state, to obtain the maximum of F the measures on each particle must be noncommutative, i.e., $[A, A'] \neq 0$ and $[B, B'] \neq 0$; however, for a disentangled states, to obtain the maximum of F the measures on one of the two particles must be commutative, i.e., $[A, A'] = 0$ or $[B, B'] = 0$. For notational convenience, we assume a pure state

$$|\psi\rangle = k_1 |01\rangle + k_2 |10\rangle . \tag{3}$$

Let the observables $A = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{n}$, $A' = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{n}'$, $B = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{m}$, $B' = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{m}'$ be the spin projections onto unit 3-vectors $\vec{n}, \vec{n}'$ for particle a, and $\vec{m}, \vec{m}'$ for particle b. A straightforward computation yields

$$\langle \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma} \otimes \vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma} \rangle = -2k_1k_2(n_1m_1 + n_2m_2) - n_3m_3, \tag{4}$$

for all 3-vectors $\vec{n}, \vec{m}$. After some elaborations, we find that when $n_2 = n_2' = m_2 = m_2' = 0$, $n_1 = -\frac{k_1k_2}{|k_1k_2|}$, $n_3 = 0$; $n_1' = 0$, $n_3' = -1$; $m_1 = m_1' = 2|k_1k_2|(1 + 4k_1^2k_2^2)^{-1/2}$, $m_3 = -m_3' = (1 + 4k_1^2k_2^2)^{-1/2}$, the CHSH inequality is maximal for $|\psi\rangle$, $F_{\max}(\psi) = 2\sqrt{1 + 4k_1^2k_2^2}$ [12,15]. Obviously, for entangled states, i.e., $k_1 \neq 0 \neq k_2$, we have $[A, A'] = -2i\frac{k_1k_2}{|k_1k_2|}\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{e}_2 \neq 0$, $[B, B'] = -8i\frac{|k_1k_2|}{1+4k_1^2k_2^2}\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{e}_2 \neq 0$, where $\hat{e}_2$ is the direction vector. For instance, for the Bell state $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$, one has $[A, A'] = \mp 2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{e}_2$, $[B, B'] = -2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{e}_2$. However, for the factorizable states , i.e., for $k_1 = 0$ or $k_2 = 0$, we have $[B, B'] = 0$, the measures on particle b are commutative.

The relation between entanglement of states and the commutativity of measures is very essential, which is an important evidence for nonlocal quantum correlations. It has no reason to think that for mixed states this evidence for nonlocal correlation can be different from the one for pure states. Thus we come to the uniform definition of entanglement for any state of bipartite system based on the commutativity of measures for maximum value of Bell inequality.

Definition: *A state is said to be entangled, if the maximum of CHSH expectation value $F_{\max}$ is obtain by non-commutative measures on each particle of two particles. A state is said to be disentangled, if the maximum of CHSH expectation value $F_{\max}$ is obtained by commutative measures on one of the pair particles.*

In order to quantify and measure the entanglement defined above, we introduce another quantum expectation value G

$$G = 2E(C, D), \tag{5}$$

where $C = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{l}$, $D = \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{h}$, and $\vec{l}, \vec{h}$ are two unit 3-vectors. One can easily find that G is a CHSH expectation value by controlling the measures on one of the two particles commutative. In analog to the above discussion of the extreme value of CHSH inequality, on finds for all the pure states the maximum values of G are the same, namely, $G_{\max}(\psi) = 2$. For example, the pure state as shown in Eq. (3), $G(\psi) = -4k_1k_2(n_1m_1 + n_2m_2) - 2n_3m_3$, one easily proves that $G_{\max}(\psi) = 2$ when $n_1 = m_1 = n_2 = m_2 = 0$, $n_3 = -m_3$.

Because G is one of CHSH expectation values, so $F_{\max}(\psi) \geq G_{\max}(\psi)$. Only for disentangled states we have $F_{\max}(\psi) = G_{\max}(\psi)$, but for any entangled states $F_{\max}(\psi) > G_{\max}(\psi)$. This relation between the two quantum

expectation values F and G is equivalence with the above definition of entanglement. We define the degree of entanglement of a state ρ as

$$P_E = \sqrt{\left(\frac{F_{\max}(\rho)}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{G_{\max}(\rho)}{2}\right)^2}. \tag{6}$$

For the pure state, $2 \leq F_{\max}(\psi) \leq 2\sqrt{2}$, $G_{\max}(\psi) = 2$, so $0 \leq P_E \leq 1$. For example, $|\psi\rangle = k_1 |01\rangle + k_2 |10\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle = k_1 |00\rangle + k_2 |11\rangle$, one can easily obtain $P_E = 2|k_1 k_2| \leq 1$. For the Bell states $|\psi^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$ and $|\phi^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$, $P_E = 1$. Obviously, when $k_1 = 0$ or $k_2 = 0$, one has $P_E = 0$. This measure of entanglement is consistent with the previous measures for pure states [14–16]. In the following, we extend our discussion to any state of two qubits.

A state of two qubits can be completely described by the following density matrix

$$\rho_{ab} = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbf{I}_2 \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \vec{\sigma}^a \cdot \vec{u} \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \mathbf{I}_2 \otimes \vec{\sigma}^b \cdot \vec{v} + \sum_{i,j}^{3} \beta_{ij} \sigma_i^a \otimes \sigma_j^b), \tag{7}$$

where $\vec{u}$ and $\vec{v}$ are Bloch vectors for particles a and b, respectively; β_{ij} are nine real numbers and can be regarded as the components of a 9-vector $\vec{\beta}$, which we call the correlation vector; $\vec{\sigma}^{a,b}$ are Pauli matrices and $\mathbf{I}_2$ is 2×2 unit matrix. By making partial trace, the reduced density matrices of two particles can be obtained as, $\rho_a = \mathrm{Tr}_b(\rho_{ab}) = (\mathbf{I}_2 + \vec{\sigma}^a \cdot \vec{u})/2$ and $\rho_b = \mathrm{Tr}_a(\rho_{ab}) = (\mathbf{I}_2 + \vec{\sigma}^b \cdot \vec{v})/2$.

We then have CHSH expectation F of the state ρ_{ab} as

$$F(\rho_{ab}) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_{ab}(A \otimes B + A \otimes B' + A' \otimes B - A' \otimes B')]. \tag{8}$$

After introducing

$$T_{ij} = (n_i + n_i')m_j + (n_i - n_i')m_j', \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \tag{9}$$

which are components of a 9-vector $\vec{T}$, one obtains

$$F(\rho_{ab}) = \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij} T_{ij} = \vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{T}, \tag{10}$$

which is just the inner product of two 9-vectors $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{T}$. For any $\vec{T}(n, n', m, m')$, $|\vec{T}| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} T_{ij}^2} = 2$, so that $F(\rho_{ab}) = 2|\vec{\beta}| \cos[\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{T})]$, in which $|\vec{\beta}| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij}^2}$ is the length of the vector $\vec{\beta}$, $\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{T})$ is the angle between $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{T}$. We denote the minimum angle of $\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{T})$ as $\gamma = \min\{\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{T})\}$, we then have $F_{\max}(\rho_{ab}) = 2|\vec{\beta}| \cos\gamma$.

Similarly, we get $G(\rho_{ab}) = 2|\vec{\beta}| \cos[\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{D})]$, and $G_{\max}(\rho_{ab}) = 2|\beta| \cos\delta$, where $\vec{D}$ is a vector with components $D_{ij} = 2l_i h_j$ and $\delta = \min\{\theta(\vec{\beta}, \vec{D})\}$. Consequently, we can formally express the degree of entanglement for a state ρ_{ab} as

$$P_E = |\vec{\beta}| \sqrt{\cos^2(\gamma) - \cos^2(\delta)}. \tag{11}$$

For a given state ρ_{ab}, one can always find the vectors $\vec{T}$ and $\vec{D}$ such that F and G reach their maximum values, respectively. This implies that we obtain proper relations among $\vec{n}, \vec{n}', \vec{m}$, and $\vec{m}'$, so do $\vec{l}$ and $\vec{h}$. At this moment, we have $[A, A'] = 2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot (\vec{n} \times \vec{n}') = 2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{X}$ and $[B, B'] = 2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot (\vec{m} \times \vec{m}') = 2i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{Y}$. Denoting the angle between $\vec{T}$ and $\vec{D}$ (which make F and G reach their maximum values, respectively) is η, one then obtains

$$|\vec{X}| \cdot |\vec{Y}| = \frac{4G_{\max} \cdot P_E}{(F_{\max})^2} = \sin(2\eta). \tag{12}$$

This formula shows an important relation between commutativity of measures and the extreme value of F. Obviously, this relation is only determined by the direction of $\vec{\beta}$. For $F_{\max} = G_{\max}$, i.e., the measures on one of two particles are commutative, one must have $|\vec{X}| = 0$ or $|\vec{Y}| = 0$, from the above formula we obtain $P_E = 0$. This feature is in agreement with Eq. (6) as well as our definition of entanglement.

What does it mean when the entanglement degree of a state is zero? We can find that there are only two cases when $P_E = 0$. Case 1: when $|\vec{\beta}| = 0$, $F_{\max}(\rho) = G_{\max}(\rho) = 0$, so does P_E. Case 2: when $\beta_{ij} = w_i r_j$, where $\vec{w}$ and $\vec{r}$

are two 3-vectors. It is easy to prove that $F_{\max}(\rho) = 2|\vec{w}| \cdot |\vec{r}|$ and $G_{\max}(\rho) = 2|\vec{w}| \cdot |\vec{r}|$, so that $P_E = 0$. For these two cases, one finds that the rank of the so-called correlation matrix

$$\beta_M = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} & \beta_{13} \\ \beta_{21} & \beta_{22} & \beta_{23} \\ \beta_{31} & \beta_{32} & \beta_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

is not higher than one, namely, $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$. It has been proved that, for $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$, a state ρ is separable, i.e., this state can be represented as a mixture of factorizable pure states [20]. In other words, for $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$ and $|\vec{\beta}| \neq 0$, one can always find two unit 3-vectors $\vec{w}$ and $\vec{r}$ by which the components of correlation vector are expressed as $\beta_{ij} = w_i r_j$, this must lead to $P_E = 0$. Then we come to an important result: for a state of bipartite system ρ_{ab}, if and only if $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$, its degree of entanglement is zero, i.e., $P_E = 0$; at this moment the state is separable. In other words, if the rank of correlation matrix of a state is higher than 1, then this state is entangled with nonzero degree of entanglement.

The above analysis implies that not all of the separable state has zero degree of entanglement. To see this point clearly, let us consider the Werner state [21] in the form

$$\rho = (1-\alpha)\frac{I_4}{4} + \alpha \left|\psi^+\right\rangle \left\langle\psi^+\right|. \tag{13}$$

Its correlation matrix of the above state is $\beta_M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\alpha \end{pmatrix}$. It has been proved that when $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{3}$ the above state is separable [22]. For the maximally entangled state $|\psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$, its corresponding correlation matrix is $\beta_M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$; obviously this correlation vector is paralleling to the correlation vector of the state given in (13), so the commutative relations of measures on each particle for these two state should be the same, thus the state given in (13) is entangled based on our definition. From (11) it can be easily obtain $P_E = \alpha$. For the above state, although it is saparable for $\alpha \leq 1/3$, it still has nonzero degree of entanglement $P_E = \alpha$.

Therefore, the degree of entanglement of a state is zero means that the state is separable. However, a separable state does not always mean that its degree of entanglement is zero (based on our definition) unless $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$. This viewpoint is somewhat different from other considerations [14,17,18] in which a separable state is regarded as a disentangled state.

The above discussions of entanglement can be understand in another way. We assume an inequality for any state as

$$-|G_{\max}(\rho)| \leq F(\rho) \leq |G_{\max}(\rho)|. \tag{14}$$

Then, one can find that any entangled state must violate this inequality. The maximum violations of the above inequality can be formally expressed as

$$F_{\max}(\rho) = 2\sqrt{\left(\frac{G_{\max}(\rho)}{2}\right)^2 + P_E^2}. \tag{15}$$

For pure states, the inequality (14) reduces to Eq. (2). Obviously, Eq. (15) is just a straightforward generalization of the formulae that Gisin presented for pure states [12].

In conclusion, we have presented an alternative definition of quantum entanglement for any state of bipartite system based on the CHSH inequality. In our definition, if a state is disentangled, the maximum of the CHSH expectation value can be only obtained by commutative measures on one of the two particles. Meanwhile, this state is separable with the rank of correlation matrix $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$. Under this definition, we introduce a uniform measure to quantify the entanglement (see Eq.(15)), which is a straightforward extension for the case of pure state. We also find that there exists an important relation between the commutativity of measures and maximum of CHSH expectation value, which exhibits a simple geometric significance (see Eq. (12)).

It can be noted that our definition of entanglement is different from the traditional understanding of entanglement for mixed state of bipartite system. In our definition not all the separable states are disentangled, only the states with $\text{rank}[\beta_M] \leq 1$ are disentangled; but in traditional consideration, the separable states should be disentangled. We cannot tell which definition is good since the entanglement of mixed state has not yet been resolved well. Anyway,

whether there exist entanglement and nonlocal correlations in separable states is still a debate so far [23,24]. Nevertheless, the understanding of quantum entanglement based on our definition has a clear and simple physical picture. The distinction between entangled states and disentangled states is clear and in the uniform physical interpretation for both pure and mixed states. The measure of entanglement we have proposed makes the evaluation of entanglement for bipartite system very easy. These features should facilitate the discussion of some problems concerning entanglement and have possible important applications in the future.

---

[1] E. Schrödinger, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
[2] J.S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[3] A. Einstein, B. Podosky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[4] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
[5] A.K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[6] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, *Quantum cryptography*, e-print quant-th/0101098.
[7] The theoretical proposals are in C.H. Bennett et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993); L. Davidovich et al., Phys. Rev. A **50**, R895 (1994). For the experiments see D. Boschi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1121 (1998); A. Furusawa et al., Science **282**, 706 (1998); M.A. Nielsen et al., Nature **396**, 52 (1998).
[8] C.H. Bennett and S.J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2281 (1992).
[9] H.-K, Lo, T. Spiller and S. Popescu (eds.), Introduction to Quantum Computation and Information (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1998); J. Gruska, Quantum Computing (McGraw-Hill, London, 1999); G. Alber et al., Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments (Springer, Berlin, 2001).
[10] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation to Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000); D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert and A. Zeilinger (eds.), *The Physics of Quantum Information* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
[11] V. Capasso, D. Fortunato and F. Selleri, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **7**, 319 (1973).
[12] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **154**, 201 (1991); N. Gisin and A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **162**, 15 (1992).
[13] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, The Netherlands, 1993); M.A. Cirone, e-print quant-th/0110139.
[14] S. Hill and W.K Wooters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997); W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998); K.M. O'Connor and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 052302 (2001).
[15] A.F. Abouraddy, B.E.A. Saleh, A.V. Sergienko, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 050101(R) (2001).
[16] G. Jaeger, A. Shimony and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 54 (1993).
[17] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2014 (2000).
[18] J. Eisert and H.J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 022306 (2001).
[19] N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990); J.L. Cereceda, Phys. Lett. A **286**, 376 (2001).
[20] H.J. Kummer, Inter. J. Theor. Phys. **40**, 1071(2001).
[21] R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[22] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996); see also M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[23] O. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2493 (1998); O. Cohen, Phys. Rev. A 60, 80 (1999); O. Cohen, Phys. Rev. A 63, 016102 (2001).
[24] D.R. Terno, Phys. Rev. A 63, 016101 (2001).